



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/826,480	04/16/2004	Vidur Apparao	AOL0145	1518

22862 7590 11/23/2007
GLENN PATENT GROUP
3475 EDISON WAY, SUITE L
MENLO PARK, CA 94025

EXAMINER

EHICHIOYA, FRED I

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2162

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

11/23/2007

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/826,480

Applicant(s)

APPARAO ET AL.

Examiner

Fred I. Ehichioya

Art Unit

2162

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 September 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1 - 45 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1 - 45 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This Office Action is responsive to communication filed September 18, 2007.
2. Claims 1 – 45 are pending in this Office Action.

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant argues:

(a) the cited art does not teach or describe displaying a user's personal browser history in a screen display that simultaneously displays links to the user's personal browser history as sorted through all of a personalized Web favorites list, a time-based history, and a category based hierarchy (page12, paragraph 1).

Examiner respectfully disagrees with the applicant. Firstly, the term "simultaneously displays link" is not defined by the claim, the specification does not provide a standard for ascertaining the requisite degree, and one of ordinary skill in the art would not be reasonably apprised of the scope of the invention; and secondly, it is noted that "sorted through all" is not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993). However, Liu discloses screen display (fig. 16 step 108), a personalized Web favorites list (see column 16, lines 59 – 61), a time-based history (column 4, lines 32 – 39) and a category based hierarchy (see column 9, lines 39 – 41).

(b) The cited art does not teach or describe establishing a new category using the metadata of the user visited URLs (page12, paragraph 2).

Examiner respectfully disagrees with the applicant. The term "establishing a new category" is not defined by the claims, the specification does not provide a standard for ascertaining the requisite degree, and one of ordinary skill in the art would not be reasonably apprised of the scope of the invention.

(c) Applicant can find no teaching or suggestion within any of the cited art as using meta data to present the personalized Web favorites lists (page13, paragraph 1).

Examiner respectfully disagrees with the applicant. However, Liu discloses using metadata thus obtained (column 18, lines 16 - 18) to present a user's personal browser history (column 16, lines 59 – 61) in a category based hierarchy (column 9, lines 38 - 41).

(d) Nielsen does not teach or suggest categorizing nor does Nielsen teach or suggest any form of iteratively retrying a reverse lookup based upon a less specific part of the URL (page 15, paragraph 1).

Examiner respectfully disagrees with the applicant. Nielsen discloses iteratively retrying (see column 11, line 62 – column 12, lines 10) said reverse lookup using a less specific part of said URL until a category is found (column 7, lines 3 – 10).

(e) Nielsen and Liu do not combine to teach a single interface allowing a user to see pages previously viewed by that user and to navigate to a wider view of similar pages, Such as those categorized by the Open Directory Project (page 15, paragraph 3).

Examiner respectfully disagrees with the applicant. In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., "such as those categorized by open directory project") are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

4. In view of the above response to applicant's argument, Examiner contends that the rejection of the last Office Action is proper.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

5. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

The terms "simultaneously displaying links" in claim 1 is a relative term which renders the claim indefinite. The term " simultaneously displaying links " is not defined by the claim, the specification does not provide a standard for ascertaining the requisite degree, and one of ordinary skill in the art would not be reasonably apprised of the scope of the invention.

The terms "establishing a new category" in claim 23 is a relative term which renders the claim indefinite. The term "establishing a new category" is not defined by the claim, the specification does not provide a standard for ascertaining the requisite

Art Unit: 2162

degree, and one of ordinary skill in the art would not be reasonably apprised of the scope of the invention.

Regarding claims 17 and 39, the phrase "might be worth" renders the claims indefinite because it is unclear whether the limitations following the phrase are part of the claimed invention. See MPEP § 2173.05(d).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 1 – 4, 23 – 26 and 45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Briggs et al., "Briggs" U.S. Patent No. 7,080,139 in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,839,690 issued to Liu et al., (Hereinafter "Liu").

Regarding claims 1, 23 and 45, Briggs discloses a method for establishing and maintaining a categorized Web browsing history, comprising the steps of: using a directory service (column 12, line 66 – column 13, line 2) to get category metadata about user visited URLs (column 2, lines 60 – 67).

Briggs does not explicitly teach using metadata thus obtained to present a user's personal browser history in a category based hierarchy as claimed.

Liu discloses using metadata thus obtained (column 18, lines 16 - 18) to present a user's personal browser history (column 16, lines 59 – 61) in a screen display simultaneously displaying links to all of (Fig.16 step 108):

a personalized Web favorites list (column 4, lines 34 - 35);

a time-based history (column 4, lines 32 – 39);

a category based hierarchy (column 9, lines 38 - 41); and

establishing a new category using said metadata of said user visited URLs (column 51, lines 32 – 38).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skills in the art at the time of present invention to combine the cited references because Liu's teaching of "using metadata a category based hierarchy" would have allowed Biggs's system to match a web page to any number of categories. The motivation is that this matched categories described what a web page is about, and provide a means by which the visitor's interest can be identified.

Regarding claims 2 and 24, Briggs discloses wherein said directory service comprises the Open Directory Project (Fig. 15 step 1506 and column 3, line 4).

Regarding claims 3 and 25, Briggs discloses wherein said directory service comprises a database, that exposes a Web interface, and that allows navigating through categories to find Web sites (column 2, lines 50 – 55).

Regarding claims 4 and 26, Briggs discloses wherein said categories are structured as trees, where each node of a tree has zero or one parents and zero or many children (column 8, lines 37 – 38).

8. Claims 5 – 17, and 27 – 39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jakob Nielsen, “Nielsen” U.S Patent No. 5,761,436 in view of Liu.

Regarding claims 5 and 27, Nielsen discloses a method for establishing and maintaining a categorized Web browsing history, comprising the steps of:

performing a reverse lookup in a database to find a chain of categories for a URL (Fig. 4 and column 7, lines 1 – 10), every time a URL that has not been previously seen is added to a history (column 7, lines 11 – 15); and

for URLs for which there is no category in said database, iteratively retrying (see column 11, line 62 – column 12, lines 10) said reverse lookup using a less specific part of said URL until a category is found (column 7, lines 3 – 10).

Nielsen does not explicitly teach categorized web browsing history as claimed.

Liu discloses presenting a resulting categorized web browsing history (column 18, lines 16 - 18).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skills in the art at the time of present invention to combine the cited references because Liu’s teaching of “using metadata a category based hierarchy” would have allowed Nielsen’s system to match a web page to any number of categories. The motivation is that this matched

categories described what a web page is about, and provide a means by which the visitor's interest can be identified.

Regarding claims 6 and 28, Nielsen discloses using standard relational database technology to store and query a local representation of said categories (column 8, lines 33 – 35).

Regarding claims 7 and 29, using a row in a first database table for each category node, wherein each row has a parent field to represent a node in a category chain (column 8, lines 7 – 12).

Regarding claims 8 and 30, Nielsen discloses using a second database table to store a relationship between each URL and its one specific category node (column 6, lines 1 – 4).

Regarding claims 9 and 31, Nielsen discloses given a category path, adding rows for any nodes that are not already in said local database (column 6, lines 56 – 63); and

setting parent links appropriately (column 6, lines 32 – 46).

Regarding claims 10 and 32, Nielsen discloses using standard relational database querying to find children categories of any given category by querying, for all category nodes whose parent is a given category (column 8, lines 20 – 26).

Regarding claims 11 and 33, Nielsen discloses finding all URLs for a given category by querying for all URLs associated with said category (column 6, lines 1 – 4).

Regarding claims 12 and 34, Nielsen discloses providing an interactive user interface that allows users to navigate among categories corresponding to URLs that have been previously visited while browsing (column 7, lines 3 – 8).

Regarding claims 13 and 35, Nielsen discloses wherein said interactive user interface does not include categories that correspond to pages a user has never visited (column 6, lines 17 – 18 and column 9, lines 1 – 2).

Regarding claims 14 and 36, Nielsen discloses wherein said user interface for a hierarchy of data displayed as either of a tree list and a series of Web-style pages (Abstract).

Regarding claims 15 and 37, Nielsen discloses wherein said user interface allows users to re-find Web Sites by drilling down through familiar categories (column 4, lines 6 – 15).

Regarding claims 16 and 38, Nielsen discloses wherein said user interface allows users to discover groups of previously visited pages, which happen to fall into a same category (Fig. 4), wherein said previously visited pages comprise pages previously visited by a user of said user interface (column 7, lines 3 - 7).

Regarding claims 17 and 39, Nielsen discloses wherein from any given category display, said user interface supplies a link back to a full Web page for that category (Fig.4); wherein within a same user interface, a user can focus on previously visited by said user and then navigate to a wider view of similar pages that might be worth exploring (column 7, lines 3 - 7).

9. Claims 18 – 22 and 40 – 44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nielsen in view over Liu and further in view of Briggs.

Regarding claims 18 and 40, Nielsen and Liu disclose the claimed subject matter as discussed in the independent claims 5 and 27 respectively. Nielsen does not Open Directory Project as claimed.

Briggs discloses wherein said database comprises the Open Directory Project (column 3, line 4).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skills in the art at the time of present invention to combine the cited references because Briggs' teaching of Open Directory Project would have allow Nielsen and Liu's system to categorized previously visited URLs and contents. This categorization makes it easy to select and display desired previously displayed URL links.

Regarding claims 19 and 41, Briggs discloses wherein said database exposes a Web interface, and allows navigating through categories to find Web sites (column 10, lines 1 – 11).

Regarding claims 20 and 42, Briggs discloses providing a plurality of Web browsing tools that display metadata and that allow capturing an image or Web page (column 2, line – column 3, line 5);

wherein said tools comprise any of Save Page and Stop Watching; and

wherein said metadata comprise any of Rating, Comments, Snapshots, and Categories (column 10, line 66 – column 11, line 17).

Regarding claims 21 and 43, Briggs discloses storing captured Web pages as part of a media library (column 3, lines 39 – 48);

wherein a captured Web page may be viewed and searched even if an original page is changed or becomes unavailable (column 6, lines 47 – 51).

Regarding claims 22 and 44, Briggs discloses viewing Web pages that have either been captured locally or that are part of a browsing history as any of a passively personalized Web favorites list and in a time-based history view (column 2, lines 45 – 66).

Conclusion

10. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Fred I. Ehichioya whose telephone number is 571-272-4034. The examiner can normally be reached on M - F 8:00 AM to 4:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John E. Breene can be reached on 571-272-4107. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Fred I. Ehichioya/

November 14, 2007


SHAHID ALAM
PRIMARY EXAMINER